

**Eickholt, Brad**

---

**From:** brmolitor@msn.com%inter2 [brmolitor@msn.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 01, 2005 3:19 PM  
**To:** FarmBill  
**Subject:** Comments on Farmbill

**Attachments:** tmp.htm; Farm Bill Comments.doc



tmp.htm (10 KB)



Farm Bill  
Comments.doc (30 KB)

Farm Bill Comments by:

Brian Molitor  
23198 Lillehei Avenue  
Hastings, MN 55033  
651-983-8254

December 1, 2005

My name is Brian Molitor. I farm with my family in SE Minnesota. I would like to respond to question #3 of which we are invited to give our comments.

3. How should farm policy be designed to effectively and fairly distribute assistance to producers?

There was much debate and many man hours but into the 2002 Farm Bill, and I think it is a working. It helps us farmers weather the storms given the unpredictable weather and market conditions, uncertainties involved with international trade, the value of the dollar, and variable input costs.

Planting Flexibility: I think we should continue to have this flexibility given to us in the 1996 Farm Bill and not consider reverting to provisions that would require the farmers to plant specific program crops to receive support payments.

AMTA Payment/PFC Payment/Direct Payment: I support continuing decoupled payments based upon cropping history rather than current plantings.

Payment Limits: I oppose any changes in current farm bill payment limitations. Our farming operations has never hit the current payment limitations, but I am still opposed to reducing these limits. I am a corn and soybean farmer in SE Minnesota. My costs per acre that I farm are similar to my neighbors who are larger than me and also similar to my neighbors who are smaller than me. Actually, my neighbors who are larger than me may have even higher costs than I do given they have to spend greater amounts of money on bigger

and more equipment to get there work done. I do NOT feel that we should limit the larger farmers income per acre with reduced payment limitations. This is giving them an unfair advantage. In my opinion, it is not about the total dollars, but about the dollars per acre per crop. Give each producer an equal opportunity.

Given the reduced margins farming, agriculture has made some changes. We are seeing more part time farmers who have jobs in town. In order to support a family or a number of families on the farm now, more acres are needed. Farmers are either expanding or getting off farm jobs. If 30% of the farmers farm 70% of the land, they should get 70% of the subsidies. My neighbor who has a part time job and 200 acres should not get as much as many dollars as my other neighbor who is farming 2000 acres. They should get similar amounts per acre, but not similar total dollars.

This year is a perfect example as to why we should NOT reduce payment limitations. Many farmers in our area sell corn to the elevator directly out of the field. This year, we had a cash price down to \$1.17 per bushel. Fortunately, we were able to get an LDP of around \$.50 to get us up to \$1.67 per bushel. Given the low prices this year our LDP was high and many average size farmers did run into there payment limitations. First of all, if there was no LDP, it would be safe to say that many farmers would go broke at those kind of price levels. Even the farmers that did collect up to there limit will still have a difficult time as they will be OK on the acres that collected up to the limit, but the additional acres they will lose money.

Bottom line for me is that I do not enjoy taking the subsidies from the government, but given other inequities around the world, it is necessary to keep US farmers competitive. I do hope that we can reduce and eventually eliminate government subsidies to the farmer, but in doing so I ask that we do it fairly looking at per acre per crop basis, not per farmer basis. Thank you.

Brian Molitor

23198 Lillehie Avenue

Hastings, MN 55033

651-983-8264

## Farm Bill Comments

December 1, 2005

My name is Brian Molitor. I farm with my family in SE Minnesota. I would like to respond to question #3 of which we are invited to give our comments.

3. How should farm policy be designed to effectively and fairly distribute assistance to producers?

There was much debate and many man hours but into the 2002 Farm Bill, and I think it is a working. It helps us farmers weather the storms given the unpredictable weather and market conditions, uncertainties involved with international trade, the value of the dollar, and variable input costs.

**Planting Flexibility:** I think we should continue to have this flexibility given to us in the 1996 Farm Bill and not consider reverting to provisions that would require the farmers to plant specific program crops to receive support payments.

**AMTA Payment/PFC Payment/Direct Payment:** I support continuing decoupled payments based upon cropping history rather than current plantings.

**Payment Limits:** I oppose any changes in current farm bill payment limitations. Our farming operations has never hit the current payment limitations, but I am still opposed to reducing these limits. I am a corn and soybean farmer in SE Minnesota. My costs per acre that I farm are similar to my neighbors who are larger than me and also similar to my neighbors who are smaller than me. Actually, my neighbors who are larger than me may have even higher costs than I do given they have to spend greater amounts of money on bigger and more equipment to get there work done. I do NOT feel that we should limit the larger farmers income per acre with reduced payment limitations. This is giving them an unfair advantage. In my opinion, it is not about the total dollars, but about the dollars per acre per crop. Give each producer an equal opportunity.

Given the reduced margins farming, agriculture has made some changes. We are seeing more part time farmers who have jobs in town. In order to support a family or a number of families on the farm now, more acres are needed. Farmers are either expanding or getting off farm jobs. If 30% of the farmers farm 70% of the land, they should get 70% of the subsidies. My neighbor who has a part time job and 200 acres should not get as much as many dollars as my other neighbor who is farming 2000 acres. They should get similar amounts per acre, but not similar total dollars.

This year is a perfect example as to why we should NOT reduce payment limitations. Many farmers in our area sell corn to the elevator directly out of the field . This year, we had a cash price down to \$1.17 per bushel. Fortunately, we were able to get an LDP of around \$.50 to get us up to \$1.67 per bushel. Given the low prices this year our LDP was high and many average size farmers did run into there payment limitations. First of all, if there was no LDP, it would be safe to say that many farmers would go broke at those kind of price levels. Even the farmers that did collect up to there limit will still have a difficult time as they will be OK on the acres that collected up to the limit, but the additional acres they will lose money.

Bottom line for me is that I do not enjoy taking the subsidies from the government, but given other inequities around the world, it is necessary to keep US farmers competitive. I do hope that we can reduce and eventually eliminate government subsidies to the farmer, but in doing so I ask that we do it fairly looking at per acre per crop basis, not per farmer basis. Thank you.

Brian Molitor  
23198 Lillehie Avenue  
Hastings, MN 55033  
651-983-8264